DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 152 774 SP 012 580

AUTHOR Adams, Ronald D.
TITLE Presentation and Simulation of an Illustrative Model for the Evaluation of Teacher Education Graduates (ETEG).
PUB DATE 22 Feb 78
NOTE 40p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Chicago, Illinois, February 21-24, 1978); For related document, see ED080 485

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Graduates; *Education Majors; *Followup Studies; Higher Education; Models; *Program Planning; *Simulation; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Evaluation

ABSTRACT

A simulated planning session for the implementation of a model for the Evaluation of Teacher Education Graduates (ETEG) is presented. A brief introduction to the model, published by J. T. Sandefur in 1972 as "An Illustrated Model for the Evaluation of Teacher Education Graduates," is contained for reference purposes. Participants in the simulation are to select one of three hypothetical institutional settings for which the implementation of the ETEG model is to be planned. Five tasks are specified for completion during the simulation: (1) followup and sample identification; (2) instrument identification; (3) determination of data collection procedures; (4) formulation of general project administration; and (5) determination of feedback procedures. (MJB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

PRESENTATION AND SIMULATION

OF

AN ILLUSTRATIVE MODEL FOR THE

EVALUATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION GRADUATES

(ETEG)

AACTE ANNUAL MEETING

FEBRUARY 22, 1978

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

SP012 580

AGENDA FOR PROGRAM

WHEN	WHAT	WHO
1:45 - 1:50	Orientation	Edell Hearn
1:50 - 2:00	Introduction of Participants & Purpose of Program	Jerry Ayers
2:00 - 2:15	Background and Theory of Evaluation Model	J. T. Sandefur
2:15 - 2:30	General Procedures	Ronald D. Adams
2:30 - 3:30	Simulation	Western Kentucky University Team Edward Ball — Carl Martray Norman Ehresman — Jack Neel Curtis Englebright — Steve Schnacke Tennessee Technological University James Dotson — Sylvester Kohut
3:30 - 3:50	Reports	Group Reporters
3:50 - 4:10	WKU and TTU Programs	Ronald D. Adams and Jerry Ayers
4:10 - 4:15	Wrap-up	Edell Hearn

SECTION ONE: INTRODUCTION

In response to requests for assistance in meeting the national Standards for Accreditation of Teacher Education, the Commission on Standards sponsored the development of alternative strategies to focus upon the application of these Standards. J. T. Sandefur, then dean of the Graduate College, at Western Kentucky University, was given the charge to develop a model to evaluate teacher education graduates. This model entitled, An Illustrated Model for the Evaluation of Teacher Education Graduates, was published in 1972 and has since been generally regarded as a defensible approach to the evaluation of teacher education programs.

The purpose of this afternoon meeting is to acquaint you with the model for Evaluation of Teacher Education Graduates (ETEG) and to provide a simulated planning session for the implementation of this model. A brief introduction of the model will be presented and is also contained in SECTION TWO of this document for reference purposes.

There are three hypothetical settings for which the implementation of the ETEG model will be planned. You and the participants seated at your table will simulate a planning session for one of these settings using the specific circumstances described in SECTION THREE. Specific instructions for conducting the planning session are given in SECTION FOUR.

At the conclusion of the simulation, information from each table will be summarized and a spokesman may be asked to present a two-minute (or less) summary of your group's solution. Questions regarding any aspect of the simulation should be directed to the team leader assigned to your table. As you can see from the preceding agenda, time is of the essence, so please, try to stay within the time alloted for each activity.

At this time, the ETEG model will be presented by members of the panel. SECTION II contains information about the ETEG model for reference purposes.

SECTION TWO: The Evaluation of Teacher Education Graduates (ETEG)

Sandefur made the following observation regarding evaluation systems:

> Any model for evaluating the product of teacher education will be inadequate and incomplete. The problems are too great and the knowledge about evaluation too limited to allow the presentation of a model which is not subject to criticism. The proposed model presented in this paper may be subject to an infinite number of valid criticisms. However, it should be explicitly understood that the plan has been offered only as a suggestion to those institutions facing the responsibility of evaluating the teachers they have prepared. Moreover, it should be recognized that the recommended model, despite its inadequacies, has been based on logically inferred generalizations drawn from relevant research.

Sandefur proceeded from two assumptions: 1) that a sufficient body of research existed from which inferences could be drawn about the characteristics of good teaching and good teachers and 2) that evaluative tools were available which enable the assessment of teaching in a systematic fashion. After an extensive review of the literature (through 1971), the following generalizations were made:

1. <u>Good teaching utilizes maximal involvement of the student in direct experiential situations</u>.

   Good teachers attempt to foster problem-oriented, self-directed, actively inquiring patterns of learning behavior of their students.

   Good teachers elicit pupil-initiated talk and allow more pupil-initiated exploration and trial solutions.

   When teachers try to elicit independent thinking from their students, they get it.

   Good teachers involve students in decision-making processes in active, self-directing ways.

   Teachers who are interested in student involvement are less prone to dominate the classroom through lecture and other teacher activities.

2. <u>Good teaching encourages maximal "freedom" for the student</u>.

   Good teachers use significantly more praise and encouragement for the student.

   They accept, use, and clarify student ideas more often.

They give fewer directions, less criticism, less justification of the teacher's authority, and less negative feedback.

They use a relaxed conversational teaching style.

They use more divergent questions, do more probing, and are less procedural.

They are more inclined to recognize the "affective climate" of the classroom and are responsive to student feelings.

Teachers with low dogmatism scores are more likely to use indirect methods than those with more closed-minded attitudes.

3. Good teachers tend to exhibit identifiable personal traits broadly characterized by warmth, a democratic attitude, affective awareness, and a personal concern for students.

Good teachers exhibit characteristics of fairness and democratic behavior.

They are responsive, understanding, and kindly.

They are stimulating and original in their teaching.

They are responsible and systematic.

They are poised and confident, and emotionally self-controlled.

They are adaptable and optimistic.

They are well-versed in subject matter and give evidence of a broad cultural background.

These generalizations and sub-generalizations formed the basis of an evaluation model that allowed for the assessment of teacher education graduates both while in the pre-service program and after they entered the teaching profession. The proposed model was characterized by the collection of objective, quantifiable data from multiple sources.

Procedures for the conduct of the evaluation model emphasized the need for longitudinal data with the follow-up of graduates recommended for a minimum of five years. The model outlined a plan that suggested data be collected for student teachers, first year teachers, third year teachers, and fifth year teachers.

The longitudinal data obtained from graduates would provide information on how the teacher was able to perform initially and after years of teaching experience in the classroom; data which should be of vital interest to teacher educators.

Instrumentation

Specific instrumentation was suggested by Sandefur, based on his review of the research literature on teacher effects. He suggested, "The proposed evaluative data can be derived from four categories:

A. Career line data
B. Direct classroom observation
C. Pupil, peer, and supervisor evaluations
D. Standardized measures"

A. Career Line Data

Demographic information, program success (GPA), continued professional preparation, and perception of the quality of their teacher preparation program are examples of data that constitute career line data. All these data are collected from the participating teacher and deals with their personal background, professional development, and perceptions of their preparatory program.

B. Direct Classroom Observation

A category of data that has been shown to be most important in the study of teacher effectiveness is direct observation of the teacher and students in the classroom. This observation should be systematic and provide data suitable for assessing the teacher's competency. Medley and Mitzel[1] have stated that the true role of direct observation in research on teacher effectiveness must be one in which there is some attempt made to comprehend the nature of effective teaching. Many direct

---

[1]Medley, D. M. and Mitzel, H. E. "Measuring Classroom Behavior by Systematic Observation" Handbook of Research on Teaching, N. G. Gaged, editor (Chicago: Rand McNally), 1963, p. 249.

classroom observational systems have been developed over the last few years to assess numerous teacher and pupil behaviors.

C. Pupil, Peer, and Supervisory Evaluations

It seems reasonable to collect data from sources most closely associated with the teacher--students, peers, and supervisors. While the research has been less than conclusive regarding the reliability of data from these sources, enough evidence exists that supports their use in evaluation, especially for the student's perception of teachers. The problems associated with this type of data probably are due to the lack of well-developed instruments.

D. Standardized Measures (Personality Characteristics)

The problems of standardized achievement tests for measuring student gain was discussed by Sandefur and was not recommended as a means of evaluation for products of teacher education programs. However, more research is needed in this area to determine those teaching competencies and characteristics that should and can be evaluated.

Sandefur suggested that standardized measures be used to assess certain personality characteristics which seem desirable in teachers, especially the measure of authoritarianism. However, he points out the inconclusiveness of the research in this area.

Data Processing and Analyses

The variety of magnitude of data collected from this evaluation system requires the use of computer-assisted data processing, storage, and analyses. A variety of analysis techniques may be employed to determine the meaningful relationships that exist among data. These analyses must be governed by specific questions that relate to teacher education program development and the teacher characteristics and behaviors as demonstrated by the graduate.

Information Feedback to Program

For this evaluation model to have impact on teacher education programs, some means must be established to communicate the evaluation outcomes to teacher educators. Preferably, this system should consist of a two-way dialogue between evaluators and program faculty. Joint interpretations of findings should allow for maximum utilization of this system.

Considerations for Implementation

Sandefur offered specific recommendations for instruments to be used in the ETEG model, based on his review of the research literature on teacher effectiveness. However, new research findings and improved measurement techniques may provide more choice in which specific instruments can be utilized by an institution wishing to implement the ETEG model. The choice of instruments should be governed by their demonstrated worth in research and how they relate the institution's program of teacher preparation. The following outline is presented as an aid in selecting instrumentation and other considerations for implementing the ETEG model. It should be emphasized that topics in this outline are only suggestions, not requirements, for implementation of the model.

Outline of Considerations for Implementing the ETEG Model

I. Instrumentation Selection

A. Career Line Data

1. Demographic Information, such as
   a. Personal data (age, sex, occupation of parents and spouse, etc.)
   b. Health status
   c. Size of community reared
   d. Size of high school graduating class

2. Success in Preparation Program

   a. Grade Point Averages
      1. Overall
      2. Subject major
      3. Professional education
      4. Student teaching grade

   b. National Teacher's Exam

3. Continued Professional Development (graduate study)

4. Perception of Teacher Education Program

5. Perceived Problems in Teaching

B. Direct Classroom Observation
   a. Systematic in procedure
   b. Provide quantifiable data
   c. Provide valid data
   d. Related to pupil outcomes
   e. Capable of inter observer reliability (at least .70)

C. Pupil, Peer, and Supervisor Evaluations

1. For All Three
   a. Provide objective data
   b. Related to classroom teaching competence
   c. Easily administered
   d. Quantifiable

2. For Pupils
   a. Spans all grade levels
   b. Short administration time
   c. Machine scorable

3. For Peer/Supervisors
   a. Respondent should be able to complete
   b. Easily scored

D. Standardized Measures

1. Pupil Standardized Measures
   a. Recognizes methodological problems of use
   b. Recognizes logistical problems of use

2. Teacher Standardized Measures
   a. Related to pupil outcomes
   b. Valid and reliable
   c. Easily administered and scored

II. Data Processing and Analyses

A. Computer Software

1. Sophisticated programs to store data

2. Programs for varied data analyses techniques

3. Instrument scoring programs
   a. Commercially available programs
   b. Custom development of programs

B. Computer Hardware

1. Computers that can accommodate the required software

2. Special machines (such as optical scan equipment)

C. Personnel For

1. Maintenance of data set(s)

2. Processing raw data onto computer storage

3. Interpretation of Analyses of Data

III. Feedback System

A. Systematic

1. Regularly scheduled (monthly, bi-annual, annual)

2. Recorded (eg. reports, summaries, charts)

3. Problem oriented

B. Communication

1. Understandable by users

2. Two-way dialogue between ETEG and program personnel

3. Flexible, yet, retained longitudinal benefits

Table 1 provides a specific example of instrumentation and observation techniques presently being utilized in two universities. These measurement techniques are an outgrowth of Sandefur's recommendations and are presented to illustrate how specific instruments were organized under the four basic categories.

Table 1

Categories of Data Collection for the ETEG Model

Variables	Source	Examples*
Career Line Data	Teacher	Demographic data questionnaire Undergraduate GPA's Graduate hours taken Inservice teacher education data National Teacher Examinations Ratings of Teacher Education Programs
Standardized Measures	Teacher	F-Scale (authoritarianism) Rokeach Dogmatism Scale Teacher Concerns Checklist
Direct Classroom Observation	Trained Observers	Interaction Analyses Classroom Observation Record Observer Checklist
Pupil, Peer, and Supervisor Evaluations	Pupils Peers Supervisor	Student Evaluation of Teaching I and II Teacher Evaluation by Peer/Supervisor

* These examples are presently in use with this system at Western Kentucky University and/or Tennessee Technological University.

Summary

The ETEG Model requires data to be collected from four general categories, career line data, direct classroom observation, pupil, peer, and supervisor ratings, and standardized measures. These data are to be collected for a minimum of five years after the student has graduated from the undergraduate teacher education program. Once data have been processed, feedback mechanisms must be established to ensure information

is available for teacher educators to use in programmatic decision making.

Please read SECTION THREE to obtain information about the specific institutional setting.

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK.

SECTION THREE: SPECIFIC SETTING

Gamma College

Gamma College is a private, church supported institution of higher education located in a semi-urban area of the state. The College has an enrollment of 1,752 students with approximately 40 percent pursuing a baccalaureate degree with emphasis in elementary and secondary education.

Approximately 60 percent (400) of the students enrolled in education are pursuing baccalaureate level work and certification at the elementary level. The remaining students are pursuing work in one of seven areas leading to the baccalaureate degree and secondary certification (general science, English, social studies, German, French, mathematics, and physical education). Each year the College graduates about 125 students who are eligible for certification. The College offers no graduate work in education.

The Department of Education enjoys a good working relationship with the public schools within a 50 mile radius. All student teachers are placed within these schools. The majority of the students complete their student teaching during the Spring quarter. About 35 percent of the graduates are able to obtain teaching positions during their first year after graduation within a 100 mile radius of the College.

The financial resources of the College are quite limited since the primary source of revenue is from student tuition and an endowment fund that has been greatly reduced because of inflation. The staff of the Department of Education consists of eight professional faculty and a full-time secretary. In addition, some limited student assistance is available.

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK.

SECTION THREE: SPECIFIC SETTING

The University of Alpha

The University of Alpha is a multi-purpose, land grant institution that has international prominence. The University has an enrollment of 32,580 students. Of this number, 872 are international students, 4,883 are from states other than Alpha and the remainder are from the state of Alpha. The University is composed of 20 schools and colleges; the second largest being the College of Education. The College of Education enrolls 4,732 undergraduates, and offers graduate work to 4,000 students. The College of Education offers work in 35 disciplines and grants the bachelor's, master's, education specialist (6th year), and the doctorate. Each year the institution graduates about 1,000 students with a Bachelor's degree; with approximately 550 being granted certification at the elementary level, 300 in a variety of secondary fields, and the remainder in such areas as special education, school music, and art education. Within the past five years the institution has experienced a 20 percent decline in enrollment in the College of Education at the undergraduate level and the enrollment in the graduate programs has remained near constant each year. The institution graduates approximately 350 students with the Master's degree, 200 complete the Education Specialist (6th year), and 50 complete the doctorate. Of those completing the master's, approximately one-half remain as classroom teachers.

The College of Education enjoys an excellent reputation as an institution for preparation of public school teachers. The College also has excellent professional relationships with the public schools throughout the state. Student teaching consists of one quarter of full-time work during the senior year. About an equal number of students are enrolled

in student teaching during each quarter (fall, winter and spring). Each year about 40 percent of the graduates are employed within the state.

The financial resources of the College of Education are excellent. The staff consists of 325 professional faculty, 80 graduate assistants supported from state funds and an additional 80 graduate students supported through extramural research and training projects. The staff of the College of Education also includes 85 technicians, secretaries, or clerks and employs approximately 200 students five hours each week. These are undergraduate students, largely receiving support through such programs as BEOG.

SECTION THREE: SPECIFIC SETTING

Beta State University

Beta State University is a state supported, regional university that serves the mid-state area. The primary service area of Beta State includes a 25 county area with a near equal representation of rural, suburban, and urban populations. Beta State has an enrollment of 10,250 students, of which approximately 90 percent are from the state of Beta. The University is composed of seven schools and colleges, the largest enrollment being in the College of Education. The College of Education enrolls 3,400 students, of which 2,500 are undergraduates and 900 are pursuing work toward the Master's and/or Education Specialist (6th year). Each year the College of Education graduates about 550 students with a bachelor's degree and certification to teach. Of this number, about 300 are granted certification in the area of early childhood education or elementary education, 180 in some area of secondary education, and the remainder in such broad certification areas as special education, school music, health education and art education. The institution also graduates about 180 students each year with a master's or education specialist in a variety of teaching fields and in the area of school service personnel. Within the past five years, the institution has experienced a leveling in its enrollment in education at both the undergraduate and graduate level.

The teacher education program at Beta State is a major element of the total mission of the University. The College of Education enjoys a good professional relationship with the schools in its service area. The home residence of about 80 percent of the students enrolled in the College of Education is within a 100 mile radius of the campus. During the past year, approximately 50 percent (275) of those students receiving

the bachelor's degree obtained employment during the first year after graduation. Of this number, almost 80 percent were employed within a 100 mile radius of the University.

Student teachers are placed throughout the primary 25 county service area of the University. Approximately one-half of the students complete their student teaching during the Spring quarter, with the remaining half about equally divided between the fall and winter quarters. University supervising teachers receive three hours of credit for each five students supervised and visit each student a minimum of eight times during the ten week quarter.

The financial resources of the College of Education are good. The staff consists of 110 professional faculty, 22 graduate assistants supported from state funds and four additional graduate students supported through extramural research and training programs. The support staff of the College consists of 25 clerks and secretaries and enjoys the services of approximately 50 students (five hours each week) who are obtaining financial support through such programs as BEOG.

SECTION FOUR: SPECIFIC TASKS

You are a member of a special committee appointed by the Dean of the College to determine an evaluation system for the teacher education programs at your institution. This committee has a "Chairperson" and a "Recorder".

> Participants who have these cards in your packet, identify yourself to the committee members.

The Chairperson is responsible for facilitating the Committee's work and keeping the committee member's on task. He or she will also be responsible for presenting the two-minute oral summary at the completion of the simulation. The Recorder will complete the required documents as decisions are made by the committee.

In earlier meetings, the literature on evaluation systems for teacher education was reviewed. Resulting from this review, the group's decision was to use the Evaluation of Teacher Education Graduates (ETEG) model as a guide to the development of an evaluation system for your college's teacher education programs. The committee's immediate task is to plan the specific procedures to be implemented using the information about the ETEG model and the information in SECTION THREE.

Since all specific information about the institution could not be given in SECTION THREE, information that the group feels must be known to make decisions can be assumed. However, these assumptions should be as realistic to the given setting as possible. For example, you can assume the Dean is supportive of your efforts and will provide some resources for the proposed evaluation system. You should not assume a $500,000 grant to finance the project.

Please record any assumptions on your blue answer sheets. If a group gets to a point that a decision cannot be made due to lack of information or procedural problems, consult your team leader.

It should be emphasized that there are no "right" or "wrong" solutions to this simulated planning session. The intent is to provide an opportunity for you to experience the planning and organization involved in implementing an evaluation system based on the ETEG model. Of course, not all factors can be considered in such a brief time, but the process could be duplicated for "real." Resources needed for the implementation should also become more apparent.

Please begin by reading the Overview of Tasks. Next, complete tasks one through five and record your decisions on the "Blue" answer sheets. It may be necessary to review and change decisions as you progress through the tasks. Summarize the tasks on the pink summary sheet provided. One extra copy of the Blue answer sheets and the pink summary sheet should be prepared by the recorder and given to the team leader at the end of this exercise.

The three sections on the "Blue" answer sheets are for your use in working through this exercise. Only the "Answer" column must be completed. The "Rational" column is for comments you came to make about the reasons for your decision in the "Answer" column. The "Assumptions" column is for the assumptions you make about the institutional setting, support, resources, etc.

OVERVIEW OF TASKS

		Time
TASK ONE	Follow-up and Sample Identification	10 minutes
TASK TWO	Instrument Identification	10 minutes
TASK THREE	Data Collection Procedures	10 minutes
TASK FOUR	General Project Administration	10 minutes
TASK FIVE	Feedback Procedures	10 minutes
	Summary of Tasks	10 minutes

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK.

Follow-up

Question 1. How long does our school wish to follow-up students?

Alternatives

a. For one year
b. For two years
c. For three years
d. For four years
e. For five years
f. For six years
g. For seven years
h. Other (explain)

Question 2. How often do we wish to obtain data from our teacher education graduates?

Alternatives

a. Sample every year - visit every year
b. Sample every year - visit every other year
c. Sample every other year - visit every year
d. Sample every other year - visit every other year
e. Other (explain)

Sample Identification

Question 1. How many graduates will we use in the study?

Alternatives

a. Sample size of 20
b. Sample size of 30
c. Sample size of 40
d. Sample size of 50
e. Sample size of 60
f. Total number of students graduating
g. Other (explain)

Question 2. When will data collection begin?

Alternatives

a. Incoming students in teacher education
b. Student teachers
c. Graduates who are first year teachers
d. Other (explain)

Question 3. How will we select the follow-up sample of students?

Alternatives

a. Simple random sampling
b. Random sampling from predetermined strata
c. Purposeful sampling
d. Use sample of volunteers
e. Other (explain)

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK.

FOLLOW-UP

	Answer	Rationale	Assumptions
Question 1.			
Question 2.			

SAMPLE IDENTIFICATION

	Answer	Rationale	Assumptions
Question 1.			
Question 2.			
Question 3.			

Instrumentation Identification

Question 1. How will we obtain instruments to assess Career Line Data?

Alternatives

a. Use instrument already in use at institution
b. Identify instrument in use somewhere else
c. Develop instrument locally
d. Have instrument developed by paid consultants
e. Omit this category of data
f. Other (explain)

Question 2. How will we select Standardized Measures?

Alternatives

a. Use existing data already being obtained from standardized tests
b. Implement standardized testing program recommended by faculty
c. Implement standardized testing program as recommended by paid consultants
d. Omit this category of data
e. Other (explain)

Question 3. How will we select Direct Classroom Observation system(s)?

Alternatives

a. Use direct classroom observation techniques already in operation at the institution
b. Develop an observation system
c. Use an already established observation system (like, Flanders Interaction Analysis)
d. Have consultants develop and/or recommend a system
e. Omit this category of data
f. Other (explain)

Question 4. How will we select Pupil Evaluation instruments?

Alternatives

a. Use existing instruments already in use by our institution
b. Have faculty develop instruments
c. Have faculty identify and procure instrument(s)
d. Have paid consultants develop and/or select instruments
e. Omit this category of data
f. Other (explain)

Instrumentation Identification

Question 4b. How will we select Supervisor Evaluation instruments?

Alternatives

a. Use existing instruments already in use by our institution
b. Have faculty develop instruments
c. Have faculty identify and procure instrument(s)
d. Have paid consultants develop and/or select instruments
e. Omit this category of data
f. Other (explain)

Question 4c. How will we select Peer Evaluation instruments?

Alternatives

a. Use existing instruments already in use by our institution
b. Have faculty develop instruments
c. Have faculty identify and procure instrument(s)
d. Have paid consultants develop and/or select instruments
e. Omit this category of data
f. Other (explain)

Question 5. Will we use other sources than the above? If so, explain briefly.

Alternatives

a. Parents evaluation of teachers
b. Professional teacher organization evaluation
c. Community evaluation
d. School board evaluation
e. Other (explain)

TASK TWO

INSTRUMENTATION IDENTIFICATION

	Answer	Rationale	Assumptions
Question 1.			
Question 2.			
Question 3.			
Question 4.			
Question 4b.			
Question 4c.			
Question 5.			

Data Collection Procedures

Question 1. Will we need to provide for special training in the administration of instrument(s)? If so, who will provide this training?

Alternatives

a. No special training needed
b. Faculty has expertise for training
c. Consultants will be hired to do training
d. Other (explain)

Question 2. Who will administer the instruments?

Alternatives

a. Existing faculty
b. Existing administrative staff
c. New faculty
d. New administrative staff
e. Graduate assistants
f. Specially hired personnel outside institution
g. Combination of above (explain)
h. Other (explain)

Question 3. When will instruments be administered?

Alternatives

a. At the end of the school year
b. At the beginning of the school year
c. During the middle of the school year
d. At the beginning and end of the school year
e. Other (explain)

Question 4. How often will instruments be administered?

a. Once per data collection period
b. Twice per data collection period
c. Three times per data collection period
d. Other (explain)

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK.

TASK THREE

DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

	Answer	Rationale	Assumptions
Question 1.			
Question 2.			
Question 3.			
Question 4.			

General Project Administration

Question 1. Who will administer the program? If faculty, from where will personnel time come?

Alternatives

a. Department Head or Dean of Education
b. Administrative Assistant
c. Director, Bureau of Educational Research
d. Other Administration
e. Faculty member
f. Other (explain)

Question 2. Will there be travel involved? If so, from where will the expenses come?

Alternatives

a. No
b. Yes, existing departmental budget
c. Yes, special appropriation from college funds
d. Yes, special appropriation from university funds
e. Yes, special appropriation from state funds
f. Yes, outside funding
g. Other (explain)

Question 3. Where will other costs come from, such as, printing of instruments, etc.?

Alternatives

a. Existing departmental budget
b. Special appropriation from college funds
c. Special appropriation from university funds
d. Special appropriation from state funds
e. Outside funding (explain)
f. Other (explain)

Question 4a. What kind of data processing will be required?

Alternatives

a. Data processing done by "hand"
b. Data processing done by computer
c. Combination of a & b
d. Other (explain)

General Project Administration

Question 4b. From where will data processing resources come?

Alternatives

a. Computer not utilized
b. Computer located on campus
c. Computer located at state level
d. Other (explain)

Question 4c. Who will do these tasks?

Alternatives

a. Faculty
b. Administrators
c. Graduate Assistants
d. Personnel outside department or college but employed by institution
e. Consultants outside institution
f. Other (explain)

GENERAL PROJECT ADMINISTRATION

Answer	Rationale	Assumptions
Question 1.		
Question 2.		
Question 3.		
Question 4a.		
Question 4b.		
Question 4c.		

Feedback Procedures

Question 1. Who is responsible for initiating and maintaining the feedback system?

Alternatives

a. Dean, College of Education
b. Department Head(s)
c. Director, Bureau of Research
d. Director of evaluation program if different from above
e. Special appointed faculty other than director of evaluation program
f. Other (explain)

Question 2. How will the procedure work?

Alternatives

a. Dissemination through reports
b. Special faculty meeting scheduled
c. Regular departmental meetings
d. Informal conversation in faculty lounge
e. Special room for study of data by faculty
f. Publication in school student paper
g. Three to five day seminars for indepth study of data by faculty on voluntary basis
h. Other (explain)

Question 3. How often and at what times will the feedback occur?

Alternatives

a. Continuous and ongoing feedback
b. Four times per year
c. Three times per year
d. Twice per year
e. Once per year
f. Other (explain)

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK.

The cost of printing this publication by Western Kentucky University was paid from State funds KRS 57.375.

TASK FIVE

FEEDBACK PROCEDURES

	Answer	Rationale	Assumptions
Question 1.			
Question 2.			
Question 3.			